

### EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it **MUST** be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.
2. Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Catherine K. Kinslow (registration no. 51,886) on June 23, 2009.
3. The application has been amended as follows:  
*Claim 1 has been amended, and claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled.*

### IN THE CLAIMS:

1. (Currently Amended) A method for migrating data between a first database and a second database, the method comprising the steps of:  
determining, by a processing unit in a computer, dependencies among a plurality of tables in the first database;  
storing the determined dependencies to indicate the table dependencies;  
retrieving metadata from the first database, wherein the metadata includes definitions for tables in the first database;

storing the retrieved metadata;

reading data from tables in the first database using a plurality of read operations, wherein the read operations are structured in accordance with the retrieved metadata, and wherein the read operations are in an order indicated by the determined dependencies; and

writing data to the second database using a plurality of write operations, wherein the write operations are in an order indicated by the determined dependencies.

2-3. (Cancelled)

4. (Original) The method of claim 1 further comprising:

performing a predetermined modification operation on the data read from the tables in the first database prior to a write operation to the second database.

5. (Original) The method of claim 4 further comprising:

storing the predetermined modification operation using markup language to identify the predetermined modification operation.

6. (Original) The method of claim 1 wherein the first database and the second database have dissimilar schemas.

7-18. (Cancelled)

19. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1 wherein the write operations are in an order indicated by the determined dependencies to ensure referential integrity in the second database.

20. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 4 wherein the predetermined modification operation comprises assigning a default value to a field in a table in the second database that does not have a corresponding field in a corresponding table in the first database.

4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Applicant's arguments filed in the Appeal Brief regarding the prior art rejection cited under 35 USC 103(a) citing Ishihara et al. in view of Ofek et al., and 35 USC 103(a) Ishihara et al. in view of Ofek et al. and Underwood are found *persuasive*. The attached Examiner's Amendment overcomes the rejection cited under 35 USC 101. The prior art of record fails to teach the following limitation regarding migration of data: *"determining, by a processing unit in a computer, dependencies among a plurality of tables in the first database; storing the determined dependencies to indicate the table dependencies; retrieving metadata from the first database, wherein the metadata includes definitions for tables in the first database; storing the retrieved metadata; reading data from tables in the first database using a plurality of read operations,*

*wherein the read operations are structured in accordance with the retrieved metadata, and wherein the read operations are in an order indicated by the determined dependencies; and writing data to the second database" .*

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

### ***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Swamy et al. US Patent 6,874,141 B1 teaches mapping data between a source schema and target schema and determining source node dependencies, however they do not teach the method for migration as recited in independent claim 1 with respect to use of metadata including definitions for tables in the first database as claimed.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greta L. Robinson whose telephone number is (571)272-4118. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tony Mahmoudi can be reached on (571)272-4078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Greta L. Robinson/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2169  
June 23, 2009